

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/9327.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bhagwan Dass Ghai and Sons Re-Rollers (P) Ltd., Plot No. 25, Sector-6, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI R.N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 2/1982

between

SHRI RAM LALIT, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BHAGWAN DASS
GHAI AND SONS RE-ROLLERS (P) LTD., PLOT NO. 25, SECTOR-6, FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri H. R. Dua and Shri Duli Chand along with Shri. B.L. Ghai, Managing Director of the Respondent.
None for the workman.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between Shri Ram Lalit, workman and the Management of M/s. Bhagwan Dass Ghai and Sons Re-Rollers (P) Ltd., Plot No. 25, Sector-6, Faridabad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Ram Lalit, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices were issued to both the parties. It may be mentioned that on the last date of hearing, none appeared on behalf of the workman even though he was represented previously and as such *ex parte* proceedings are ordered against the workman. Shri B. L. Ghai, Managing Director of the respondent and Shri Duli Chand, representative of the management stated that the dispute between the workman and the management had already been settled and that the written request of the workman was Ex.M-1 and his affidavit was Ex. M-2 which were correct and the same bore the signatures of the workman and that no dispute was now left between the parties. In view of the testimony of Shri B. L. Ghai, Managing Director of the respondent and Shri Duli Chand, representative of the management and recitals made in the documents Ex. M-1 to M-2, the dispute between the parties stands settled. The award is passed accordingly.

R. N. BATRA,

Dated, the 12th December, 1984.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1594, dated the 13th December, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/9329.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and management of M/s Metlaze Industries, Plot No. 223, Sector-24, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 7/1984

between

SHRI CHHABILA PARSHAD, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S METLAZE
INDUSTRIES, PLOT NO. 223, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri Amar Singh Sharma for the workman.
Shri Devinderjit Singh Chawla for the respondent.

AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Chhabila Parshad, workman and the Management of M/s Metlaze Industries, Plot No. 223, Sector-24, Faridabad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Chhabila Parshad, was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Notices were issued to both the parties. On the last date of hearing, Shri Devinderjit Singh Chawla, Manager of the respondent stated that the dispute between the parties had already been settled and that the workman had already received Rs. 750 from the management in the full and final settlement of his claim,—vide documents Ex.M-1 to M-3 and that no dispute was now left between the parties. Shri Amar Singh Sharma, representative of the workman, stated that he had heard the above statement made by the representative of the management, which was correct and that no dispute was now left between the parties in terms of the settlement mentioned above. In view of the testimony of Shri Devinderjit Singh Chawla, Manager of the respondent and Shri Amar Singh Sharma, representative of workman, and recitals made in the documents Ex. M-1 to M-3, the dispute between the parties stands settled. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated, the 18th December, 1984.

R. N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1605, dated 18th December, 1984

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-Lab./9330.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, of 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Metlaze Industries, Plot, No. 223, Sector-24, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI R.N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 8/1984

between

SHRI CHANDER PAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S METLAZE INDUSTRIES, PLOT NO. 223, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri Amar Singh Sharma for the workman.

Shri Devinderjit Singh for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Chander Pal, workman and the management of M/s Metlaze Industries, Plot No. 223, Sector-24, Faridabad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Chander Pal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Notices were issued to both the parties. On the last date of hearing, Shri Devinderjit Singh Chawla, management of the respondent-management, stated that the workman had already been taken back on duty and his request in that respect was Ex. M-1 and that no dispute was now left between the parties. Shri Amar Singh Sharma, representative of the workman stated that he had heard the above statement made by the representative of the management which was correct and that no dispute was now left between the parties. In view of the testimony of Shri Devinderjit Singh Chawla, Manager of the respondent-management and Shri Amar Singh Sharma, representative of the workman and recitals made in the document Ex. M-1, the dispute between the parties stands settled. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated, the 18th December, 1984.

R. N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1606, dated the 18th December, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/9333.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Sachdeva Metal Industries, Jagadhri:—

BEFORE SHRI R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 143/1984

between

THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SACHDEVA METAL INDUSTRIES, JAGADHRI AND ITS
WORKMEN

Present :—

None.

AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Sachdeva Metal Industries, Jagadhri and its workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication :—

Whether the workmen of the factory are entitled to the attendance card ? If so, to what details ?

Notices of the reference were sent to both the parties. It may be mentioned that on the last date of hearing, notice of the workman had not been received back and the presumption, therefore, is that the registered notice had been received by them. None was present on behalf of the workman and as such *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against them. None appeared on behalf of the management even though they were represented previously and as such *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the management. It appears that both the parties are not interested in the reference. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated, the 18th December, 1984.

R. N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1609, dated the 18th December, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-6 Lab/9379.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s (i) Superintending Engineer, Haryana State Electricity Board, Delhi Circle, Delhi-35 (ii) Executive Engineer, Haryana State Electricity Board, Suburban Division, Fazilpur, Sonapat:—

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 92 of 83

between

SHRI OM PARKASH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S (i) SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD, DELHI CIRCLE, DELHI-35 (ii) EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD, SUBURBAN DIVISION FAZILPUR, SONEPAT.

Present :—

Shri R. S. Lakra, A. R. for the workman.

Shri N. P. Singh, L. A. for the respondent.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Om Parkash and the management of M/s (i) Superintending Engineer, Haryana State Electricity Board, Delhi Circle, Delhi-35 (ii) Executive Engineer, Haryana State Electricity Board, Suburban Division, Fazilpur, Sonapat, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. ID/30925-31, dated 30th June, 1983:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Om Parkash was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was employed as casual worker with the respondent since 1st November, 1979 on monthly wages of Rs. 270 and that his services were terminated orally by the respondent on 29th February, 1982 in gross violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. A reply was filed by the respondent, controverting the claim of the petitioner in toto. I need not discuss the pleas taken by the respondent as this reference is being answered on grounds other than merits.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issue was framed for decision by me on 20th September, 1984 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Om Parkash, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

5. Before the parties could adduce any evidence, the workman made a statement that he does not want to prosecute this reference, because earlier a reference on the same grounds is pending this Court and as such he does not want to prosecute this reference. So, this reference is dismissed and answered accordingly. There is no order as to costs.

Dated the 14th December, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 92-83/3828, dated the 20th December, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/9381.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bansal Paper Mills, Industrial Area, Bahadurgarh (Rohtak):—

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 232 of 84

between

SHRI RAJINDER SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. BANSAL PAPER MILLS, INDUSTRIAL AREA, BAHADURGARH (ROHTAK).

Present :—

None, for the workman.

Shri M. M. Kaushal, A. R. for the management.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Rajender Singh and the management of M/s. Bansal Paper Mills, Industrial Area, Bahadurgarh (Rohtak), to this Court for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. 38142—47, dated 16th October, 1984 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Rajender Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The respondent appeared but the workman did not. The case of the workman is that he was employed with the respondent as a Security Guard on 12th December, 1981 and that his services were terminated by the respondent on 2nd July, 1982 without any lawful excuse and in flagrant disregard of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. As already observed that the workman did not appear but the management placed on record a photo copy of the settlement arrived at with the workman. The same is mark "X". Mark "Y" is the photo copy of the receipt executed by the workman. Thereunder, the workman has been paid a sum of Rs. 610 by the respondent in full and final settlement of the claim of the petitioner. So, now, no dispute survives for adjudication. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated 14th December, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endst No. 232/84/3830, dated the 20th December, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.